

1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CASBN 118321)
United States Attorney

2 MARK KROTOSKI (CASBN 138549)
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 DEREK R. OWENS (CASBN 230237)
Special Assistant United States Attorney

5 CATHERINE BLOOM
6 Law Clerk

7 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 11th Floor
San Francisco, California 94102
8 Telephone: (415) 436-7200 (San Francisco)
Fax: (415) 436-7234

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff

10
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
14
15

16 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 KANESHA EIA BOYD,
20

21 Defendant.
22

CR No.: CR No. 07-0012 MEJ

STIPULATION AND ~~[PROPOSED]~~
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME

23 On February 6, 2007, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that
24 time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from February 6, 2007 to
25 February 27, 2007 for effective preparation of defense counsel to review the discovery for the
26 case and consult with the defendant. The parties represented that granting the continuance was
27 the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of both defense counsel and the United
28 States, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

Stipulation and [Proposed] Order

~~Chambers Copy - Do Not E-File~~

FILED

FEB 08 2007

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1 The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance
2 outweighed the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §
3 3161(h)(8)(A).

4 SO STIPULATED:

5 KEVIN V. RYAN
United States Attorney

6
7 DATED: 02/06/07 _____

/s/ Derek R. Owens

8 DEREK R. OWENS
Special Assistant United States Attorney

9 DATED: 02/07/07 _____

/s/ Steve Kalar

10 STEVE KALAR
Attorney for Defendant

11
12 As the Court found on February 6, 2007, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds
13 that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and
14 the defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act
15 calculations from February 6, 2007 to February 27, 2007 for effective preparation of defense
16 counsel and the United States. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the
17 requested continuance would deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation
18 and continuity of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a
19 miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

20
21 SO ORDERED.

22 DATED: 2-9-07 _____

23 MARIA-ELENA JAMES
United States Magistrate Judge